



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,846	10/30/2003	David Sacquitne	16729-1	2845
23486	7590	04/13/2004	EXAMINER	
SHUTTLEWORTH & INGERSOLL, P.L.C.			PETRAVICK, MEREDITH C	
115 3RD STREET SE, SUITE 500				
P.O. BOX 2107			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
CEDAR RAPIDS, IA 52406			3671	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/605,846	SACQUITNE, DAVID
Examiner	Art Unit	
Meredith C Petravick	3671	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/30/2003.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 5 and 9-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bozarth 2,500,448.

Bozarth discloses a sieve in a combine harvester including:

- a frame (15) attached to the harvester
- a plurality of longitudinal planks (11-13) pivotally combine with the frame so as to pivot about their longitudinal axis
- a plurality of sieve holes (inherent in a screen)
- a pendulum (36) engaged to the planks for pivoting the planks

In regards to claim 2, the planks are combined with the frame by pivot pins (18-20).

In regards to claim 3, longitudinal dividers (25-26) are positioned between the planks.

In regards to claim 5, levers (21-23) and a rod (24) operatively connect the pendulum to the planks.

In regards to claim 9, the pendulum has a leash (39).

In regards to claim 10, the method is disclosed in the use of the apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozarth in view of Ricketts et al. 5,041,059 and Silvis et al. 744,696.

Bozarth discloses the device described above. However, Bozarth does not disclose any details of the structure of the screen.

Like Bozarth, Ricketts et al. discloses a screen for a combine harvester. Unlike Bozarth, Ricketts et al. teaches that the sieve is made from louvers that are angled rearwardly with openings (88). Ricketts et al. teaches the openings can have different configurations (Column 6, lines 56-58).

Like Bozarth and Ricketts et al., Silvis et al. discloses a screen (Fig. 8) for a grain separator. However, in Ricketts et al. the screen has oblong openings (r6).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the screen in Bozarth have oblong opening as in Silvis et al. that are rewardly angled as taught in Ricketts et al., as one commonly know type of screen used to separate grain.

5. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bozarth.

Bozarth discloses the claimed invention except for providing only three planks instead of four or five. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide one or two additional planks, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claim 4 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meredith Petravick whose telephone number is 703-305-0047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will, can be reached at 703-308-3870.

Art Unit: 3671

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113. The fax number for this Group is 703-872-9306.



Meredith Petrvick
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3671

April 5, 2004